

Introduction

Markus Bockmuehl

“In the beginning, [when] God created the heavens and the earth...”

To Jews and Christians, this has always seemed a foundational statement about who we are and how we got here. But debates of the last two centuries richly illustrate the extent to which religion and science have struggled even to maintain a common conversation about it – let alone to agree on what, if anything, it might truthfully mean.

The last two centuries have seen vast and, for the ordinary observer, often disorientating gains in scientific understanding – not just of the fundamental cosmological and physical kind, but also in terms of empirical observation whether of astronomy or palaeobiology. For a long time the most obvious dissensions have concerned questions of *origins*: how did life – including our own life – evolve on this planet? Does the universe itself have a finite beginning or end? Do we perhaps inhabit just one of a vast number of parallel universes?

Christian theology, too, has travelled a long way from debates about the supposedly “literal” meaning of Genesis that once occupied public concern in the 19th and early 20th centuries, but which would in fact have seemed incomprehensibly myopic not just to classical authors¹ but equally to the leading Christian teachers of late antiquity.² Meanwhile, scientific ideas of quantum physics, general relativity or indeed evolution have long been invoked with mixed success and persuasiveness by theologians, apologists and others as providing a way out of discourses mired in either scientific determinism or a God of ever-shrinking gaps.

All this has certainly assisted while in recent years has become a newly reinvigorated engagement with the Christian doctrine of creation “out of nothing” – and with the objections to it that have emerged from a variety of directions both scientific and ideological, and many

of which are engaged in the pages that follow.³ Are we, for all this effort, any nearer to understanding what that opening quotation might signify in the 21st century? In his 2016 Reith lectures on the origins of the Universe and the nature of Black Holes, the iconic British cosmologist Stephen Hawking reiterated the famous dictum of Pierre-Simon Laplace (1749-1827) that science has no need for the “hypothesis” of God. The point in other words is not so much to deny God’s existence as to insist that “he doesn’t intervene” in scientific laws.⁴

In relation to that fundamental question of God’s relation to the world, what might “creation” signify?

I. Creation *ex Nihilo*? The Oxford-Notre Dame Project

It was against the backdrop of questions like these that the editors of this volume called together a group of scholars from across a wide spectrum of expertise to investigate one ancient and seemingly obsolescent aspect of this debate. What, if anything, does the Judeo-Christian tradition now have to say about its ancient doctrine that the nature of God’s relation to the world is always, both initially and continually, sovereign and unconditioned – in other words, creation “out of nothing”, *ex nihilo*? What could that possibly mean? Why and how did this idea arise out of a biblical tradition that *prima facie* appears not to support it? And what significance or relevance, if any, might this doctrine still have today, whether for theology or for the dialogue between religion and science?

Our research project, jointly funded by our two universities, devoted to these questions an intensive seminar at Keble College, Oxford in July 2014, followed by a larger conference at Notre Dame a year later. This is an appropriate place for us to express our sincere thanks to both the John Fell Fund at the University of Oxford and the Faculty Research Support Program at the University of Notre Dame, whose generous support made possible the planning and implementation of both consultations and thereby facilitated the

production of the volume here presented. Without the material support and the impeccable hospitality extended by conference teams at both our universities, the conversations facilitated by this project could not have been brought to fruition.

The preliminary fruits of our labours are here presented in the hope that they will help to energise the continuing rediscovery of this subject matter's importance for theology more broadly. We lay no claim to comprehensive coverage either historically, philosophically or indeed cosmologically. Nevertheless the resulting volume offers a contribution that is greater than the eclectic sum of its parts, offering for perhaps the first time a reconsideration of the doctrine against such a broad historical sweep of exegetical, theological, philosophical and scientific reflection.

The discussion below clearly illustrates that the questions thus resourced and articulated promise rich potential for continued research and interdisciplinary engagement, both between theology's own subdisciplines and also with those of scientific cosmology. And of course our work here is extensively indebted to a much larger forum of debate and publications on this subject, some of them authored by contributors and other participants in these conferences.

II. The Argument of This Volume

In keeping with the central research question for this project, the present volume is divided into five parts, progressing from the doctrine's biblical roots to its eclipse in modern theology – and on to the question of its interface and relevance, if any, to scientific cosmology.

1. Biblical Roots

The first and most extensive addresses the Biblical origins of the doctrine of creation *ex nihilo*.

Gary A. Anderson's opening essay takes its starting point from the *locus classicus* of Genesis 1, showing that while the Hebrew text appears to show God creating the world out of pre-existing matter, even the earliest Jewish translations and interpretations of this text already voice the understanding that this act of creation includes the materials from which God proceeds to make the world. Yet even the priestly creation account's emphatic elimination of polytheistic themes of conflict against chaos from the standard ancient near Eastern cosmogonies already demonstrates that the divine act of creation is for Scripture constrained by no rival or contingency, matched in Genesis 2.1-3 in a definitive and indeed eschatological rest. Anderson follows Ian McFarland, Janet Soskice and Kathryn Tanner in noting that far from being preoccupied with protological interpretations of Genesis 1, the Christian development of this doctrine is less concerned with how the world came to be than with how it is sustained and governed.⁵ Unlike for Graeco-Roman philosophy, matter does not limit what God can do: God's unconstrained sovereignty over the world does not exclude but include his intimate involvement with his creatures, and indeed it alone permits the interrelationship of human and divine agency.

Examining "why *creatio ex nihilo* for theology today?", Janet M. Soskice recovers what she finds to have been be a foundational but also a "recessive" doctrine, often unexamined in modern times. Instead of implying any preoccupation either with ecological matters or with "Big Bang"-type theories of the origins of the universe, this is above all part of the doctrine of God rather than a statement about the nature of the world. It concerns God's sovereign power, goodness and freedom to create, to govern and to sustain – involving a 'scripturally driven' metaphysics which means that, even if not itself 'in the Bible', the

doctrine is nevertheless ‘biblical’. And far from asserting an aloof or oppressive deity as some like Catherine Keller imagine,⁶ the development of creation *ex nihilo* from its biblical roots in Philo and the Patristic authors foregrounds God’s simultaneous transcendence and presence, immutability and mercy, intimately – and in the end christologically – sustaining the goodness of his creation, “all things visible and invisible”.

Following these programmatic essays to set the stage, two further chapters sample particular cross-sections of the biblical evidence. Richard J. Clifford reviews key Old Testament texts in comparison with other ancient near Eastern material.⁷ While Sumerian and especially Akkadian cosmogonies like *Enuma Elish* and *Atrahasis* clearly influenced the biblical accounts, Genesis 1 distinctively stresses the sovereign and complete transformation of chaos into order, and darkness into divine light while Genesis 2-3 introduces “agricultural” and especially “anthropological” scenarios of creation. Chaos threatens to return in other ways, as Job implies; the Psalms implore God to rule as King again in the face of the apparent reintroduction of chaos in the destruction of the temple, while Deutero-Isaiah relates the restoration of Zion to a renewal of the exodus and of creation.

The New Testament has in the past also borne the burden of furnishing proof for a Christian doctrine of creation *ex nihilo*. In the wake of critiques by Gerhard May, Frances Young and others, however, it has long been recognized that formerly ‘classic’ proof-texts like Romans 4.17 (cf. John 1.3; Colossians 1.16; Hebrews 11.3) fall some considerable way short of the doctrine of creation specifically “out of nothing”, which they were once assumed to establish.⁸ Importantly, several Pauline texts in particular demonstrate a vital link between creation and *resurrection* that is also, incidentally, familiar among rabbinic commentators.⁹ But while all agree that the New Testament statements are *compatible* with God’s sovereign creation *ex nihilo*, what they actually affirm is arguably rather less specific than this.

That said, however, many New Testament texts do in fact support precisely the “metaphysics” of creation to which we have already alluded – including in Paul, John and Hebrews. An exciting and richly suggestive reading of this insight in a more unexpected location is the subject of Sean P. McDonough’s interpretation of “Being and Nothingness in the Book of Revelation”.¹⁰ Revelation’s repeated, Christologically articulated affirmation of God as “the One Who Is and Was and Is to Come” contrasts the One who sits on the throne against the transitory nature of all other power in earth and even in heaven. This contrast plays out particularly vis-à-vis the Nothingness of the Dragon and the two Beasts who find their culminating shape in the political ‘counter-creation’ of Babylon. They are a kind of anti-trinity that ‘was and is not’ and goes to destruction, flagging the real potential of a dismantling or ‘decreation’ of earth and heaven *into* Nothing.¹¹ This is a possibility that, like the ‘Nothingness’ of evil (familiar to Augustine but also developed by Karl Barth), is superseded in the end only by the revelation of the New Jerusalem, and God’s concomitant resurrection of the flesh *ex nihilo*.

With his treatment of creation and matter in Philo of Alexandria (c. 20 BC – c. AD 50), Gregory Sterling enables the argument to transition from the biblical to the patristic discussion. Taking his cue from Philo’s influential but much-debated and variant statements about the origin of matter and about the temporality or eternity of creation, Sterling examines *De Opificio Mundi* as a test case. Standing within the extensive reception history of both Genesis 1 and Plato’s *Timaeus*, Philo identifies God and matter as the two causes of creation, one active and one passive, with God introducing order into the chaos of matter. Both are apparently eternal in *De Opificio* (in contrast to *De Providentia*, which may address a more elite audience in his own school). His primary concern throughout, however, is the unique transcendence and eternal power of God as the one who constitutes order into the temporality and chaos of matter. Thus, although Philo never asserts creation *ex nihilo*, he insists on the

uniquely transcendent role of God in creation, thereby constituting an important bridge between Hellenistic and early Christian thought and setting the stage for the explicit articulation of this doctrine.

2. Creation out of Nothing in the Ancient and Medieval Church

The three following contributions survey the Christian development of the doctrine in late antiquity and the Middle Ages.

Khaled Anatolios examines Athanasius (c. 296-373) in *Against the Greeks* and *On the Incarnation* as among the most definitive statements of creation *ex nihilo* in all of patristic literature. Most significantly, perhaps, this doctrine is seen to carry existential as well as metaphysical import: in terms of the latter, creation *ex nihilo* rests in the idea of God's goodness, which comes to sublime expression in all creatureliness wholly and exclusively subsisting as the gift of God. Creatures commune with God exclusively through ecstatic participation in God's life, which in the self-giving narrative of Christ makes good the shortcomings of creation. Existentially, however, that metaphysic also sustains the very fibre of human life. It does so not least by overcoming death, which demonstrates humanity's propensity to Nothingness, *ad nihilum*, wherever the gift of communion in the divine life is either absent or rejected – a theme distinctly reminiscent of motifs encountered in Revelation, above. In so doing, the cross and resurrection effect a creation *ex nihilo* afresh, a “therapy of death” whose appropriation Anatolios finds ideally encapsulated in the Eucharist.

Working in the Western Mediterranean a little over half a century later, Augustine (354-430) takes this doctrine of creation out of nothing as a given – and yet, as John C. Cavadini shows, both creation and nothingness are not straightforward either as philosophical concepts or as derivatives of Scripture, but rather remain grounded in the primacy of

revelation itself. The very possibility of being, potential itself, is already the creational gift of God. Far from being a “myth”, Genesis expresses (and “compresses”) the reality of God’s works analogously through the language of human experience in just the same way as the remainder of the biblical history does: creation and salvation constitute the same narrative. Augustine’s further reflection on this in the *Confessions* gives voice to his ultimate conviction that the unmerited goodness of creation, out of nothingness and formlessness, is most visibly recapitulated in redemption – and evokes our response of unreserved thanksgiving.

Joseph Wawrykow traces the further development of this doctrine in two great thirteenth-century doctors of the church, Aquinas (c. 1225-74) and Bonaventure (c. 1217-74). Both carry forward the Fathers’ doctrinal theme of finding in divine creation the continuity of beginning and redemptive end. For them both God creates freely and intentionally in a Trinitarian act, granting both potentiality and actuality *ex nihilo*. Divine creation is good, free and unconstrained. For Aquinas in particular, this finds an important point of departure in scriptural commentary. Aquinas also considers that God *could* have created (though he did not) a world without temporal beginning or end: *ex nihilo* means simply that only by the divine gift does a creature come into being and flourishing, and without this it would cease to exist. Turning then from creation’s beginning to its end, created being attains its fulfilment in communion with God, a coming forth that is at the same time a return to its source. For Bonaventure the study of visible reality furnishes traces of the Word – that is the Uncreated and Incarnate Christ – showing the world to be the Creator’s handiwork. Aquinas finds creation and salvation to be furnishing joint proof of the Triune God’s love, wisdom, and desire for communion with others.

3. Creation *Ex Nihilo* in Jewish Thought

One of the more intriguing twists in the history of the idea of creation *ex nihilo* is the extent to which the doctrine appears to have taken shape partly in parallel and partly in observable interaction with Jewish and indeed Muslim thought in late antiquity and the Middle Ages. Two chapters addressing its impact in Judaism must here suffice to document this development.

The first, by Tzvi Novick, highlights the extent to which rabbinic thought is concerned with this doctrine not only from the cosmological point of view of God's creation of matter but also, and with equal seriousness, with an eye to God's intimate providential involvement in the world's affairs. The doctrine in the former sense is classically articulated (though not without reticence or ambivalence) in the late antique commentary known as *Genesis Rabbah*. Novick here chooses to foreground the additional, hugely influential "mythic" theme of creation by means of the Torah as a kind of blueprint, which is widely attested in this and other rabbinic as well as liturgical literature, and draws heavily on the role of Wisdom in Proverbs 8.22, 30. This primordial Torah is not only textual but its own person, God's Logos but also his daughter espoused to Moses at Sinai, and thus potentially distinguishable as a locus of authority apart from God. Thus the Torah is at once cosmically alongside God and yet in some sense dependent from him.

Moving forward to the 12th century, Daniel Davies examines the importance of this doctrine for the more philosophical work of Maimonides (1138-1204). What matters in the *Guide for the Perplexed* is above all divine creation as such, with the question of the world's temporal beginning left somewhat in abeyance as not subject to thorough philosophical scrutiny, since there are no logical analogies to creation either *de novo* or *ex nihilo* – and one therefore cannot rationally prove such creation to be either possible or impossible. Consideration of the Torah requires creation *de novo* and indeed the possibility of miracles:

this implies God's particular rather than merely universal knowledge, which in turn suggests that some aspects of the world may not be scientifically explicable. A more careful distinction between creation *de novo* and *ex nihilo* was only developed by subsequent interpreters of Maimonides, here found to culminate in Abrabanel (1437-1508). Davies finds it arguable that Maimonides in fact accepts an eternal creation, although this is unlikely to be rooted in a conflict sometimes supposed between divine will and divine wisdom: God is free to create or not to create, which both validates and limits the scope of philosophical reason.

4. Creation *ex Nihilo* in Christian Systematic Theology

The philosophical and theological arc of this volume's argument reaches its preliminary conclusion in three chapters addressing the doctrine's function in the history of modern systematic theology.

Cyril O'Regan sets the context by tracing modern theology's eclipse of the doctrine to the work of Baruch Spinoza (1632-77), who sought to counter earlier arguments about God's creation *ex nihilo* with a strictly mathematical account of reality. Spinoza's intellectual genealogy, O'Regan believes, is to some extent indebted to the renaissance revival of Christian Neoplatonism, culminating in the work of Giordano Bruno (1548-1600) who had developed an earlier polemic against traditional theistic accounts of the world's contingency. In his resulting naturalism and anti-supernaturalism, Spinoza went on to influence certain anti-metaphysical convictions characteristic of German Romanticism and Idealism (despite their supposed opposition to naturalistic reductionism). Drawing attention to the importance of this intellectual heritage genealogy for more recent theology including the work of Jürgen Moltmann and Catherine Keller,¹² the chapter attempts to account here for the 20th and 21st

century strength of conviction against the very viability of creation *ex nihilo* and indeed of any classical theistic account of creation.

Ruth Jackson provides a case study in the work of the seminal early 19th-century Protestant theologian Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768-1834). Developing his critical stance in dependence on Kant's critique of reason, doctrine was for him not susceptible to rational proof but only to historical taxonomy. The substance of a traditional doctrine of creation as such, by contrast, is subverted by scientific inquiry, and like all doctrine requires adaptation to the rational demands of the day. Jackson shows that Schleiermacher nevertheless develops such a doctrine as concerned not with questions of cosmogony but with the present divine purpose of sustaining and redeeming the world. Creation *ex nihilo* means simply that the world and its history are utterly contingent on God at every moment, creation and its preservation being a single act of divine will. Reality coheres as to both divine and natural causality, with scientific inquiry and faith's feeling of "absolute dependence" sharing the same world.

Our systematic section concludes with David Bentley Hart's programmatic, full-bodied account of the relationship between God, creation and evil, articulated in a sustained dialogue with the engagement of hell and theodicy in Dostoyevsky's *The Brothers Karamazov*. He argues that, quite apart from its cosmological or metaphysical dimensions, the doctrine of creation is also a fundamentally eschatological claim about the way the world as a whole exists in relation to God and the way God exists in himself. Hart concludes that all theodicy is contingent on the doctrine of *creatio ex nihilo*, since all causes are reducible to their first – and their final – cause. This renders views of God as an agent of eternal retribution and pure sovereignty incompatible with God as loving and self-giving: such ideas are incompatible with the God who created the world good whose nature will be disclosed in full at the last judgment.

5. Creation *ex Nihilo* and Scientific Cosmology

But does all of this have any bearing on the physical world we actually inhabit and observe, and which is today so comprehensively described and codified by science and technology? This is, to be sure, no trivial question. The present project's labour on the interface of the doctrine of creation with scientific cosmology has taken a deliberately cautious, tentative and inceptive approach. This obviously leaves at one level plenty of scope for further research and interaction. At the same time, however, this tentativeness rightly expresses our sense that the points of genuine intellectual intersection and synergy between the disciplines are far from obvious but remain in need of discovery and patient exploration.

That interface is here addressed in three chapters by colleagues formally trained both as scientists and as theologians.

Adam Hincks examines the notion of creation out of nothing from the perspective of physical cosmology. Setting to one side discussions about whether God is “necessary” for the “design” of the universe, Hincks offers a brief survey of modern scientific cosmology's account of the origin of the universe including the so-called Big Bang theory, before focusing respectively on recent debates about a “multiverse” (i.e. multiple parallel universes), cyclical conceptions of time and finally quantum cosmology's efforts to articulate the possibility of a universe from nothing. The apparent fine-tuning of the physical conditions of the earliest universe has sometimes been addressed by recourse to multiple parallel universes. But even such intrinsically unverifiable theories suppose that there exists in the very fabric and matter of the universe a “landscape of possibility” whose presence creation *ex nihilo* explains in terms of the world's radical contingency of being. Scientifically, the idea that the universe could have come from nothing has attracted increasing interest even on the part of those who

seek to eliminate any divine role in creation, although this penultimate “nothing” of space and time still assumes a contingent potentiality driven by pre-existing laws of physics. In the end physical cosmology always presupposes and more concretely explicates =the same explanatory metaphysic of contingency which impels creation *ex nihilo*.

Andrew Pinsent concedes that at first sight there appears to be very little meaningful interaction between the claims of cosmology and theology. Yet might it be the case that, conversely, the loss of theological narratives of creation from the ‘background’ of our scientific thinking may in turn begin to erode the longer-term viability of our insights into cosmology? Part of the problem, Pinsent suggests, is due to misapprehensions about the very nature of scientific *insight* rather than merely quantitative analysis or deduction. True understanding is often a matter of I-you relatedness – and particularly so when the second person is divine rather than human.¹³ One aspect of God’s ways of relating to the cosmos in this way is expressed through *creatio ex nihilo*, which encourages the expectation of order in creation and has in turn shaped our understanding of the cosmos. The loss of this second-person perspective dimension in the West is documentable not only in philosophy but also in the history of art. Theological discourse enables the cultivation of such I-you insight precisely because it engages a God who seeks to communicate understanding.

In the final chapter, Andrew Davison returns once more to the recurring theme of contingency in proposing that the ‘ex’ in creation *ex nihilo* furnishes an important clue to the nature of natural science, which invariably proceeds *from* something actual to its consequences. This is true even for recent physical cosmologies involving the universe’s sudden ‘inflation’, or for that matter in accounts of ‘no boundary’ quantum gravity in which there is no longer a beginning of time. Yet science looks upon the appearing of the world from the inside of creation. It is theology, by contrast, which distinctively articulates the property of God as creating out of nothing, the divine agent constituting not an initial cause

among other causes, not just ‘the beginning’, but every moment of reality, time or space. God’s creation is the appearing of the world, of being and of potential itself, against no background.

¹ See David N. Sedley, *Creationism and its Critics in Antiquity* (66; Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007).

² See e.g. Peter Bouteneff, *Beginnings: Ancient Christian Readings of the Biblical Creation Narratives* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008).

³ In addition to Catherine Keller, Ian A. McFarland, Gerhard May, Janet M. Soskice and others referenced below, among recent publications it is worth singling out David B. Burrell, et al. eds. *Creation and the God of Abraham* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010); David Fergusson, *Creation* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014); David Vincent Meconi, *On Earth as It Is in Heaven: Cultivating a Contemporary Theology of Creation* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016). For scientific as well as ideological objections see several of the contributors to Thomas Jay Oord ed. *Theologies of Creation: Creatio ex Nihilo and Its New Rivals* (New York: Routledge, 2015).

⁴ Stephen W. Hawking, *Black Holes Ain't As Black as They Are Painted* (2016), Lecture 2 in the Reith Lectures 2016 (broadcast on BBC Radio 4 on February 2, 2016), 3: www.is.gd/Reith2016.

⁵ See Ian A. McFarland, *From Nothing: A Theology of Creation* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2014); Janet M. Soskice, "Creatio ex nihilo: Its Jewish and Christian Foundations," in *Creation and the God of Abraham*, eds. David B. Burrell, et al. (Cambridge

etc.: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 24-39; Soskice, "Creation and the Glory of Creatures," *Modern Theology* 29 (2013): 172-185 (part of an entire journal issue edited by Soskice on this topic; also published as Soskice ed. *Creation ex Nihilo and Modern Theology* (Chichester: Wiley Blackell, 2013)); Kathryn Tanner, *God and Creation in Christian Theology: Tyranny or Empowerment?* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1988).

⁶ Cf. e.g. Catherine Keller, *Face of the Deep: A Theology of Becoming* (London/New York: Routledge, 2003).

⁷ Cf. previously Richard J. Clifford, *Creation Accounts in the Ancient Near East and the Bible* (Washington: Catholic Biblical Association, 1994).

⁸ See Gerhard May, *Creatio ex Nihilo: The Doctrine of 'Creation out of Nothing' in Early Christian Thought* (trans. A. S. Worrall; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994); Frances M. Young, "'Creatio ex Nihilo': A Context for the Emergence of the Christian Doctrine of Creation," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 44 (1991), 139-151.

⁹ Cf. further Markus Bockmuehl, "The Idea of Creation out of Nothing: From Qumran to Genesis Rabbah," in *Visualising Jews Through the Ages: Literary and Material Representations of Jewishness and Judaism*, eds. Spurling and Ewence; New York/Abingdon: Routledge, 2015), 17-31 and literature cited there; see also below on Tzvi Novick's chapter in this volume (p. 12).

¹⁰ Cf. further Sean M. McDonough, *Christ as Creator: Origins of a New Testament Doctrine* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009); Jonathan T. Pennington and Sean M. McDonough, eds., *Cosmology and New Testament Theology*, Library of New Testament Studies 355 (London: T&T Clark, 2008).

¹¹ This term is often associated with the anthropology of Simone Weil (see e.g. J. P. Little, "Simone Weil's Concept of Decreation," in *Simone Weil's Philosophy of Culture: Readings*

Toward a Divine Humanity (ed. Richard H. Bell; Cambridge etc.: Cambridge University Press, 1993); Lissa McCullough, *The Religious Philosophy of Simone Weil: An Introduction* (London/New York: Tauris/Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), 171-212. An eschatological interpretation of the term is articulated by Paul J. Griffiths, *Decreation: The Last Things of All Creatures* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2014).

¹² Jürgen Moltmann, *The Trinity and the Kingdom: The Doctrine of God* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1981); Moltmann, *God in Creation: A New Theology of Creation and the Spirit of God* (The Gifford Lectures 1984-1985; San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1985); Keller, *Face of the Deep: A Theology of Becoming* (London/New York: Routledge, 2003).

¹³ Cf. further Andrew Pinsent, *The Second-Person Perspective in Aquinas's Ethics: Virtues and Gifts* (New York: Routledge, 2012).